



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/016,679

12/12/2001

Bruce E. Probst

HBO-41

2540

20583

7590

02/16/2007

JONES DAY

222 EAST 41ST ST

NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/16/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/016,679

Applicant(s)

PROBST ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T. Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has canceled claims 1-44 and added claims 45-77 in the amendment filed on 1/2/5/2007.

Claims 45-77 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 63-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "the database records on the first computer readable medium conforming to the DTD or the database records conforming to the DTD" in claims 63, lines 7-8; claim 68, line 7 and claim 72, line 9, is being indefinite because the database records are data, which can conform to the DTD.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 45-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.101 because the language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea

Art Unit: 2162

that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practice application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C 101.

Claims 45-77 recite "computer readable medium or a computer system". However, the claims fail to produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result. Thus, the bodies of claims are merely abstract idea and are being processed without any links to a practical result in the technology arts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 45-48, 52-53, 58 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Baru et al (or hereinafter "Baru") (US 7028252).

As to claim 45, Huang teaches the claimed limitations:

"computer readable medium storing data for access by an application program executing on a data processing system, the computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored on the computer readable medium for use in storing, retrieving, searching, or tracking digital assets stored in one or more databases" as DTDs for use in searching data in a database (col. 7, lines 40-41; col. 7, lines 50-55);

“the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for at least two types of digital assets, one type selected from the group consisting of photographs, movies, graphics, and text documents” as the DTD provides a list of the elements, tags, attributes, and entities contained in the document. This document contains two types movie and animation (col. 7, lines 50-55; col. 15);

Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations “ second type selected from the group consisting of audio recordings and video recordings; “DTD further comprising metadata for rights management of the at least two types of digital assets”.

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for video recording and graphic (col. 12, lines 20-67; col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru’s teaching of DTD includes attribute for rights management video recording an graphic to Huang’s system in order to search, filter and browser a specific type of information based on user’s desire in a personalized, effective manner and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file without permission.

As to claim 46, Huang teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the DTD is encoded in extensible markup language (XML)” as XML (col. 14, Appendix).

As to claim 47, Huang teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the DTD comprises metadata for at least three of photographs or movies” as (col. 14-15).

Art Unit: 2162

Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “another type selected from the group consisting of audio recordings and video recordings”.

Baru teaching video recording (col. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Sezan's teaching of attribute voice-annotation for audio and color profile for video to Sheth's system in order to allow a user to search/retrieve digital motion video or video image in a database quickly.

As to claim 48, Huang teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the DTD comprises declared elements and attributes for at least three types of digital assets, at least one type selected from the group consisting of photographs, movies, graphics, and text documents” as (col. 7, lines 50-55; col. 15).

Huang does not explicitly teaches the claimed limitation “another type selected from the group consisting of audio recordings and video recordings”.

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video recording (col. 39, col. 11, lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching to Huang's system in order to allow a user to search/retrieve digital motion video or video image in a database quickly.

As to claim 52, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the DTD comprises metadata for video recordings and further comprise a plurality of

Art Unit: 2162

metadata attributes for the video-recordings metadata, the video-recordings metadata attributes comprising a definition for rights issues regarding use of a video recordings”.

Baru teaches video recording metadata attributes comprising meta for copyrights regarding to use of a video recordings (col. 37, col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching to Huang's system in order to prevent hacker or cracker to record video data without permission.

As to claims 53 and 62, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the rights management metadata comprises at least one of: a contract identifier; an availability start date; an availability end date; an allowed number of plays per agreement; a copyright holder identifier and a worldwide rights identifier”.

Baru teaches contact name as contact identifier (col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching of contact name to Huang's system in order to prevent hacker or cracker to record video data.

As to claim 58, Huang teaches the claimed limitation “digital content selected from the group consisting of digitally encoded asset data, a link to a file containing asset data, and a reference to a location where asset data is digitally stored” as (col. 8, lines 25-40; col. 15; col. 7, lines 20-50);

"declared elements and attributes for at least three types of digital assets, at least one type selected from the group consisting of photographs, movies, graphics, promos, voiceovers, and text documents" as (col. 7, lines 20-50; col. 8, lines 25-40; col. 15).

Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "another type selected from the group consisting of audio recordings and video recordings; metadata for rights management of the at least three types of digital assets".

Baru teaches video recording metadata attributes comprising meta for copyrights regarding to use of a video recordings (col. 37, col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching to Huang's system in order to allow a user to search/retrieve digital motion video or video image in a database quickly and allow a view to manipulate voice for motion video or any different type of multimedia data easily and further prevent a hacker or cracker recording video data.

7. Claims 49, 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Baru and further in view of Sezan.

As to claims 49 and 59, Huang and Baru disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 45 and 58, except the claimed limitation "a definition for black/white; a definition for color; a definition for caption and a definition for legal restrictions associated with a photograph". Sezan teaches the management may include the capabilities of a device for providing the audio, video, and/or images. Such capabilities

Art Unit: 2162

may include, for example, screen size, stereo, AC3, DTS, color, black/white (col. 6, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Sezan's teaching of color back/white to Huang's system in order to permit a user can control color of image or movie following user's desire and understand the meaning of movie.

8. Claims 50 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Baru and further in view of Foreman et al (or hereinafter "Foreman") (USP 6628303).

As to claims 50 and 60, Huang discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 45 and 58, except the claimed limitation "a definition for music; a definition for track title; a definition for duration; a definition for compact disc (CD) number; a definition for CD title; and a definition for rights issues regarding use of an audio recording". Foreman teaches Title track, duration (fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Foreman's teaching of title track, duration to Huang's system in order to provide information about programming available on such systems to a user and save time for viewers search/view information.

Art Unit: 2162

9. Claims 51 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Baru and further in view of Reimer et al (or hereinafter "Reimer") (USP 6065042).

As to claims 51 and 61, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein DTD comprises metadata for movies and further comprises a plurality of metadata attributes for the movie metadata, the movie-metadata attributes comprising at least one of: a definition for title; a definition for version; a definition for rating; a definition for minutes; a definition for release date; a definition for run time; a definition for color; a definition for synopsis; a definition for director; a definition for cast; and a definition for allowable usage of a movie". Reimer teaches the VCR video version 702 includes five frames, whereas the corresponding shot 706 in the theatrical presentation 724 includes four frames. Each frame in the VCR video version 702 includes a unique time code. These time codes are measured from the beginning of the VCR video version 702. Since the number of frames per shot differs in the VCR video version 702 and the theatrical presentation 724, the time codes between the VCR video version 702 and the theatrical presentation 724 also differ (col. 12, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reimer's teaching of video version includes an unique time code to Huang's system in order to allow a viewer to understand meaning of version before select any version of a movie or any media.

Art Unit: 2162

10. Claims 54-55, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Montgomery and Jacobs.

As to claim 54, Huang teaches the claimed limitations:

“computer readable medium storing data for access by an application program executing on a data processing system, the computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored on the computer readable medium for use in storing, retrieving, searching, or tracking digital assets stored in one or more databases” as DTDs for use in searching data in a database (col. 7, lines 40-41; col. 7, lines 50-55);

“the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for photographic digital assets, audio digital assets” as the DTD provides a list of the elements, tags, attributes, and entities contained in the document. This document contains two types audio and animation (col. 7, lines 50-55; col. 15);

Huang does not explicitly teaches the claimed limitation “promo digital assets, and voiceover digital assets, wherein said photographic, audio, promo, and voiceover digital assets are all stored on a same computer readable medium”. Montgomery teaches storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk (fig. 4B; col. 8, lines 1-10; col. 8, lines 30-35). Jacobs teaches storing advertisements on a storage medium. The advertisements include promo sports, graphical, audio, and video (page 4, col. Left; paragraph [0026]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Montgomery’s teaching of storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk and Jacobs teaches storing advertisements on a storage

Art Unit: 2162

medium, the advertisements include promo sports, graphical, audio, and video to Huang's system in order to allow a view to manipulate voice for motion video or any different type of multimedia data and to track usage of digital content on user devices quickly.

As to claim 55, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the computer readable medium comprising the DTD is the same computer readable medium storing the photographic, audio, promo, and voiceover digital assets".

Montgomery teaches storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk (fig. 4B; col. 8, lines 1-10; col. 8, lines 30-35). Jacobs teaches storing advertisements on a storage medium. The advertisements include promo sports, graphical, audio, and video (page 4, col. Left; paragraph [0026]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Montgomery's teaching of storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk and Jacobs teaches storing advertisements on a storage medium; the advertisements include promo sports, graphical, audio, and video to Huang's system in order to allow a view to manipulate voice for motion video or any different type of multimedia data and to track usage of digital content on user devices quickly.

As to claim 57, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the rights management metadata comprises at least one of: a contract identifier; an

Art Unit: 2162

availability start date; an availability end date; an allowed number of plays per agreement; a copyright holder identifier and a worldwide rights identifier”.

Baru teaches contact name as contact identifier (col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru’s teaching of contact name to Huang’s system in order to prevent hacker or cracker to record video data without permission.

11. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Montgomery and Jacobs and further in view of Baru.

As to claim 56, Huang does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the DTD further comprise declared elements and attributes for rights management of at least two different ones of the photographic, audio, promo, and voiceover digital assets”.

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video (col. 39; col. 11, lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru’s teaching of DTD includes attribute for rights management to Huang’s system in order to search, filter and browser a specific type of information based on user’s desire in a personalized, effective manner and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file without permission.

Art Unit: 2162

12. Claims 63-65, and 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan in view of Baru et al (or hereinafter "Baru") (US 7028252).

As to claim 63, Sezan teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first computer readable medium comprising a database stored thereon, the database comprising a plurality of records, a first record identifying a photograph, a second record identifying a video recording, and a third record identifying an audio recording" as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35);

"a second computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored thereon, the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for photographs, video recordings, and audio recordings, the database records on the first computer readable medium conforming to the DTD" as (col. 4, lines 5-40; col. 14, lines 45-56);

"a central processing unit operative to access or receive data stored on the first and second computer readable mediums" as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35).

Sezan does not explicitly the claimed limitation " the DTD further comprising metadata for rights management of the photographs, video recordings and audio recordings".

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video (col. 39; col. 11, lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Sezan's teaching of selecting the video and/or video content and Baru's teaching of DTD includes attribute for rights management to

Art Unit: 2162

Huang's system in order to search, filter and browser a specific type of information based on user's desire in a personalized, effective manner and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file.

As to claims 64 and 69, Sezan teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the first computer readable medium and the second computer readable medium are the same computer readable medium" as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35).

As to claims 65 and 70, Sezan teaches the claimed limitation "a definition for black/white; a definition for color; a definition for caption and a definition for legal restrictions associated with a photograph" as the management may include the capabilities of a device for providing the audio, video, and/or images. Such capabilities may include, for example, screen size, stereo, AC3, DTS, color, black/white (col. 6, lines 25-30).

As to claims 67 and 71, Sezan does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the rights management metadata comprises at least one of: a contract identifier; an availability start date; an availability end date; an allowed number of plays per agreement; a copyright holder identifier and a worldwide rights identifier".

Baru teaches contact name as contact identifier (col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching of contact name to Sezan's system in order to prevent hacker or cracker to record video data.

As to claim 68, Sezan teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first computer readable medium comprising a database stored thereon, the database comprising a plurality of records, one record identifying a photograph, a second record identifying a video recording, and a third record identifying a text document" as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35);

"a second computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored thereon, the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for photographs, video recordings, and text documents, the database records conforming to the DTD" (col. 14, lines 45-65, fig. 2);

"a third computer readable medium comprising digital content stored thereon, the digital content comprising a photograph, a video recording, and a text document associated with the DTD and the database records" as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35);

"a central processing unit operative to access or receive data stored on the first, second, and third computer readable mediums" (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35).

Sezan does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the DTD further comprising metadata for rights management of at least one photograph and at least one video recording".

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video (col. 39; col. 11, lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Sezan's teaching of selecting the video and/or video content and Baru's teaching of DTD includes attribute for rights management to Huang's system in order to search, filter and browser a specific type of information based on user's desire in a personalized, effective manner and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file without permission.

13. Claims 63-64, 67-69 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth in view of Baru.

As to claim 63, Sheth teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first computer readable medium comprising a database stored thereon, the database comprising a plurality of records, a first record identifying a photograph, a second record identifying a video recording, and a third record identifying an audio recording" as (fig. 2, fig. 10, col. 14, lines 45-65);

"a second computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored thereon, the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for photographs, video recordings, and audio recordings, the database records on the first computer readable medium conforming to the DTD" as (col. 16, lines 55-67; fig. 6 & 9-10);

Art Unit: 2162

“a central processing unit operative to access or receive data stored on the first and second computer readable mediums” as (col. 10, lines 6-55, figs. 6&14).

Sheth does not explicitly the claimed limitation “ the DTD further comprising metadata for rights management of the photographs, video recordings and audio recordings”.

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video (col. 39; col. 11, lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching of DTD includes attribute for rights management to Sheth's system in order to search, filter and browser a specific type of information based on user's desire in a personalized, effective manner and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file.

As to claims 64, and 69, Sheth teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the first computer readable medium and the second computer readable medium are the same computer readable medium” as (col. 10, lines 6-55).

As to claims 67 and 71, Sheth does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the rights management metadata comprises at least one of: a contract identifier; an availability start date; an availability end date; an allowed number of plays per agreement; a copyright holder identifier and a worldwide rights identifier”.

Baru teaches contact name as contact identifier (col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching of contact name to Sheth's system in order to prevent hacker or cracker to record video data.

As to claim 68, Sheth teaches the claimed limitation "a first computer readable medium comprising a database stored thereon, the database comprising a plurality of records, one record identifying a photograph, a second record identifying a video recording, and a third record identifying a text document" as (figs. 1-6 & 11, col. 8, lines 20-45);

"a second computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored thereon, the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for photographs, and text documents, the database records conforming to the DTD" as (fig. 2, fig. 10, col. 14, lines 45-65);

"a third computer readable medium comprising digital content stored thereon, the digital content comprising a photograph, a video recording and a text document associated with said DTD and said database records" as (col. 16, lines 55-67; fig. 6 & 9-10);

"a central processing unit operative to access or receive data stored on the first, second, and third computer readable mediums" as (col. 10, lines 6-55, figs. 6 & 14).

Sheth does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "the DTD further comprising metadata for rights management of at least one photograph and at least one video recording".

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video recording (col. 39, col. 11, lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching of DTD includes attribute for rights management to Huang's system in order to search, filter and browser a specific type of information based on user's desire in a personalized, effective manner and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file.

14. Claims 65 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth in view of Baru and further in view of Sezan.

As to claims 65 and 70, Sheth does not teach the claimed limitation "a definition for black/white; a definition for color; a definition for caption and a definition for legal restrictions associated with a photograph". Sezan teaches the management may include the capabilities of a device for providing the audio, video, and/or images. Such capabilities may include, for example, screen size, stereo, AC3, DTS, color, black/white (col. 6, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Sezan's teaching of color back/white to Sheth's system in order to permit a user can control color of image or movie following user's desire and understand the meaning of movie.

Art Unit: 2162

15. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan in view of Baru and further in view of Foreman et al (or hereinafter "Foreman") (USP 6628303).

As to claim 66, Sezan does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a definition for music; a definition for track title; a definition for duration; a definition for compact disc (CD) number; a definition for CD title; and a definition for rights issues regarding use of an audio recording". Foreman teaches Title track, duration (fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Foreman's teaching of title track, duration to Sezan's system in order to provide information about programming available on such systems to a user and save time for viewers search/view information.

16. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth in view of Baru and further in view of Foreman et al (or hereinafter "Foreman") (USP 6628303).

As to claim 66, Sheth does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a definition for music; a definition for track title; a definition for duration; a definition for compact disc (CD) number; a definition for CD title; and a definition for rights issues regarding use of an audio recording". Foreman teaches Title track, duration (fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Foreman's teaching of title track, duration to Sheth's

Art Unit: 2162

system in order to provide information about programming available on such systems to a user and save time for viewers search/view information.

17. Claims 72-73 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth in view of Baru and Montgomery et al (or hereinafter "Montgomery") (USP 6380950).

As to claim 72, Sheth teaches the claimed limitations:

"a first computer readable medium comprising a database stored thereon, the database comprising a plurality of records, the records identifying at least two types of digital assets, at least one type selected from the group consisting of still images, movies, graphics, voice-overs, promos, and text documents" as (figs. 1-6 & 11, col. 8, lines 20-45);

"a second computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored thereon, the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for the at least two types of digital assets, the database records conforming to the DTD" as (fig. 2, fig. 10, col. 14, lines 45-65).

"a third computer readable medium comprising digital content of the at least two types of digital assets stored on and associated with the DTD and the database records; and a central processing unit operative to access or receive data stored on the first, second, and third computer readable mediums" as (fig. 6 & 14, col. 10, lines 6-55);

Sheth does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a second type selected from the group consisting of audio recordings and video recordings; the DTD further comprising metadata for rights management of at least two different types of digital assets selected from the group consisting of still images, promos, and voice-overs".

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video recording (col. 39, col. 11, lines 20-67).

Montgomery teaches storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk (fig. 4B; col. 8, lines 1-10; col. 8, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Montgomery teaches storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk and Baru's teaching of DTD includes attributes for rights management for graphic and video recording to Sheth's system in order to allow a user to search/retrieve digital motion video or video image in a database quickly and allow a view to manipulate voice for motion video or any different type of multimedia data easily and to search a portion of multimedia files via a network easily and quickly or save time searching/retrieving multimedia files and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file without permission.

As to claim 73, Sheth teaches the claimed limitation "wherein at least two of the first second, and third computer readable mediums are the same computer readable medium" as (fig. 6 & 14, col. 10, lines 6-55).

As to claim 76, Sheth does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein the rights management metadata comprises at least one of: a contract identifier; an availability start date; an availability end date; an allowed number of plays per agreement; a copyright holder identifier and a worldwide rights identifier”.

Baru teaches contact name as contact identifier (col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching of contact name to Sheth's system in order to prevent hacker or cracker to record video data.

18. Claims 72 -74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan in view of Baru and Montgomery et al (or hereinafter “Montgomery”) (USP 6380950).

As to claim 72, Sezan teaches the claimed limitations:

“a first computer readable medium comprising a database stored thereon, the database comprising a plurality of records, the records identifying at least two types of digital assets, at least one type selected from the group consisting of still images, movies, graphics, voice-overs, promos, and text documents” as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35);

“a second computer readable medium comprising a document type definition (DTD) stored thereon, the DTD comprising declared elements and attributes for the at least two types of digital assets, the database records conforming to the DTD” (col. 14, lines 45-65, fig. 2);

“a third computer readable medium comprising digital content of the at least two types of digital assets stored on and associated with the DTD and the database records; and a central processing unit operative to access or receive data stored on the first, second, and third computer readable mediums” as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35).

Sezan does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “a second type selected from the group consisting of audio recordings and video recordings; the DTD further comprising metadata for rights management of at least two different types of digital assets selected from the group consisting of still images, promos, and voice-overs”.

Baru teaches DTD includes attribute for rights management for graphic and video recording (col. 39, col. 11, lines 20-67).

Montgomery teaches storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk (fig. 4B; col. 8, lines 1-10; col. 8, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Montgomery teaches storing photographs, audio, voiceovers 492 in a disk and Baru's teaching of DTD includes attributes for rights management for graphic and video recording to Sheth's system in order to allow a user to search/retrieve digital motion video or video image in a database quickly and allow a view to manipulate voice for motion video or any different type of multimedia data easily and to search a portion of multimedia files via a network easily and quickly or save time searching/retrieving multimedia files and further to prevent hackers or crackers to modify digital media file without permission.

As to claim 73, Sezan teaches the claimed limitation "wherein at least two of the first second, and third computer readable mediums are the same computer readable medium" as (col. 19-col. 20, col. 5, lines 30-35).

As to claim 74, Sezan teaches the claimed limitation "a definition for black/white; a definition for color; a definition for caption and a definition for legal restrictions associated with a photograph" as the management may include the capabilities of a device for providing the audio, video, and/or images. Such capabilities may include, for example, screen size, stereo, AC3, DTS, color, black/white (col. 6, lines 25-30).

As to claim 76, Sezan does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the rights management metadata comprises at least one of: a contract identifier; an availability start date; an availability end date; an allowed number of plays per agreement; a copyright holder identifier and a worldwide rights identifier".

Baru teaches contact name as contact identifier (col. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Baru's teaching of contact name to Sezan's sytem in order to prevent hacker or cracker to record video data.

Art Unit: 2162

19. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth in view of Baru and Montgomery and further in view of Sezan.

As to claim 74, Sheth does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a definition for black/white; a definition for color; a definition for caption and a definition for legal restrictions associated with a photograph". Sezan teaches the management may include the capabilities of a device for providing the audio, video, and/or images. Such capabilities may include, for example, screen size, stereo, AC3, DTS, color, black/white (col. 6, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Sezan's teaching of color back/white to Sheth's system in order to permit a user can control color of image or movie following user's desire and understand the meaning of movie.

20. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan in view of Baru and Montgomery and further in view of Foreman et al (or hereinafter "Foreman") (USP 6628303).

As to claim 75, Sezan does not explicitly the claimed limitation "a definition for music; a definition for track title; a definition for duration; a definition for compact disc (CD) number; a definition for CD title; and a definition for rights issues regarding use of an audio recording". Foreman teaches Title track, duration (fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Foreman's teaching of title track, duration to Sezan's

Art Unit: 2162

system in order to provide information about programming available on such systems to a user and save time for viewers search/view information.

21. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth in view of Baru and Montgomery and further in view of Foreman et al (or hereinafter "Foreman") (USP 6628303).

As to claim 75, Sheth does not explicitly the claimed limitation "a definition for music; a definition for track title; a definition for duration; a definition for compact disc (CD) number; a definition for CD title; and a definition for rights issues regarding use of an audio recording". Foreman teaches Title track, duration (fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Foreman's teaching of title track, duration to Sheth's system in order to provide information about programming available on such systems to a user and save time for viewers search/view information.

22. Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sezan in view of Baru and Montgomery and further in view of Reimer et al (or hereinafter "Reimer") (USP 6065042).

As to claim 77, Sezan does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein DTD comprises metadata for movies and further comprises a plurality of metadata attributes for the movie metadata, the movie-metadata attributes comprising at least one of: a definition for title; a definition for version; a definition for rating; a definition for

Art Unit: 2162

minutes; a definition for release date; a definition for run time; a definition for color; a definition for synopsis; a definition for director; a definition for cast; and a definition for allowable usage of a movie". Reimer teaches the VCR video version 702 includes five frames, whereas the corresponding shot 706 in the theatrical presentation 724 includes four frames. Each frame in the VCR video version 702 includes a unique time code. These time codes are measured from the beginning of the VCR video version 702. Since the number of frames per shot differs in the VCR video version 702 and the theatrical presentation 724, the time codes between the VCR video version 702 and the theatrical presentation 724 also differ (col. 12, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reimer's teaching of video version includes an unique time code to Sezan's system in order to allow a viewer to understand meaning of version before select any version of a movie or any media.

23. Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheth in view of Baru and Montgomery and further in view of Reimer et al (or hereinafter "Reimer") (USP 6065042).

As to claim 77, Sheth does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein DTD comprises metadata for movies and further comprises a plurality of metadata attributes for the movie metadata, the movie-metadata attributes comprising at least one of: a definition for title; a definition for version; a definition for rating; a definition for minutes; a definition for release date; a definition for run time; a definition for color; a

Art Unit: 2162

definition for synopsis; a definition for director; a definition for cast; and a definition for allowable usage of a movie". Reimer teaches the VCR video version 702 includes five frames, whereas the corresponding shot 706 in the theatrical presentation 724 includes four frames. Each frame in the VCR video version 702 includes a unique time code. These time codes are measured from the beginning of the VCR video version 702. Since the number of frames per shot differs in the VCR video version 702 and the theatrical presentation 724, the time codes between the VCR video version 702 and the theatrical presentation 724 also differ (col. 12, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reimer's teaching of video version includes an unique time code to Sheth's system in order to allow a viewer to understand meaning of version before select any version of a movie or any media.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wanderski (US 6519617)

Art Unit: 2162

Contact Information

25, Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162